

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,566	12/11/2006	Frank Hartung	P18484-US1	2820
27045 ERICSSON II	7590 07/12/20: NC.	EXAMINER		
6300 LEGAC	Y DRIVE	SU, SARAH		
M/S EVR 1-C PLANO, TX 7		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
1221.0, 111	.5021		2431	•
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/12/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

kara.coffman@ericsson.com jennifer.hardin@ericsson.com melissa.rhea@ericsson.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/595,566	HARTUNG ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
SARAH SU	2431		
	10/595,566 Examiner	10/595,566 HARTUNG ET AL. Examiner Art Unit	

_ create the raining or an rappear _ mer	CXAIIIIIei	ALLOHIL	
	SARAH SU	2431	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 June 2011</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APF 1. A The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No.	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff	Appeal. To avoid aba	ice, which
a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods: a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing	ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mi		
 The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I 	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	06.07(f).		
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CPF.1.179, its calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR.1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	dension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) a
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	ACSUSA
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NO ow);	TE below);	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	, ,		the issues for
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	·	•	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		II be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,5-11,15-21,24 and 29</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	It hafara or on the data of filing a N	ation of Annual will no	at he entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affiday	rit or other evidence is	necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	ned.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet. 		n condition for allowa	nce because:
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. ☐ Other: 	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/NATHAN FLYNN/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2431	/Sarah Su/ Examiner, Art Unit 2431		

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The applicant has submitted claim amendments, and the examiner hereby withdraws the rejections to claims 1, 5-11, 15-21, 24, and 29 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The examiner has found the applicant's arguments to be non-persuasive, and the examiner maintains the grounds of rejection.

As to claim 1, it is argued that Inoue does not communicate a usage right. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Inoue discloses that each of a restriction has a corresponding ID that is transmitted (0170, lines 12-20); therefore, the transmission of an ID communicates the corresponding usage right. It is also argued that inoue does not refer to terminal-terminal rights communication. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner has interpreted a terminal as a device that communicates rights, which includes terminals and servers, as disclosed by Inoue (0170, lines 12-20).

Further, as to claim 1, it is argued that in the claimed invention, it is evident that not the same permission is passed between the devices, but subsets of previous permissions which are defined at respective sending devices. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner notes that defining a usage right as a subset of a first usage right has been interpreted as including defining the usage right as also being equal to the first usage right.